

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed September 5, 2003. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

A. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 1-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schliekelmann, et al. ("Schliekelmann," U.S. Pat. No. 6,100,994).

The rejection states that Schliekelmann discloses Applicant's invention as recited in the above-identified claims. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

B. The Schliekelmann Reference

Schliekelmann discloses a reproduction device that comprises a display panel 201. Schliekelmann, column 5, lines 54-55. As described by Schliekelmann, the display panel comprises a display screen 210 of the "LCD-color type" the size of which is "comparable to an A5-sheet". Id. at column 6, lines 10-14. As is generally known in the copying arts, A5 sheets are 148 x 210 millimeters, which roughly translates to 5.83 x 8.27 inches. Therefore, in contrast to Applicant's disclosure, Schliekelmann discloses a large display screen 210 in which many different pieces of information can be displayed to the user at the same time.

The Schliekelmann display screen is used to provide multiple layers of information to the user *at the same time*. As described by Schliekelmann:

What is important here is that *the selection of the level always remains visible on the display screen* 210, so that the user always knows the level at which he is inputting settings. This prevents the user from losing sight of the mode.

Schliekelmann, column 6, lines 55-58 (emphasis added). Examples of such operation are shown in the figures. For instance, Figure 2 shows a “Copy” button that is presented to the user in an initial screen of the display. When that button is selected, settings pertinent to copying are shown in the display *without removal of the “Copy” button*. Therefore, the user’s selections only result in features being added to the displayed screen, *not replacement of the screen with another screen*.

C. Discussion of the Rejection

It is axiomatic that “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of *each element* of the claim under consideration.” W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983)(emphasis added). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite replacing the textual indication regarding a high-level aspect of a device functionality with a graphical indication regarding a low-level aspect of the device functionality. Similarly, Claims 9 and 17 have been amended to recite a means for replacing, and logic configured to replace, the textual indication regarding a high level aspect with a graphical indication regarding a low-level aspect.

Schliekelmann does not teach or suggest replacing a textual indication of a high level aspect with a graphical indication of a low level aspect, as recited in amended

Claim 1 or the related limitations in Claims 9 and 17. In fact, as described above, Schliekelmann actually teaches the opposite: leaving an existing textual indication displayed and adding further features to it in the display.

Due at least to this shortcoming of the Schliekelmann reference, Applicant respectfully asserts that Schliekelmann does not anticipate Applicant's claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.


II. New Claims

As identified above, claims 26-29 have been added into the application through this response. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims describe an invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully requests that these claims be held to be allowable.

CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


David R. Risley
Registration No. 39,345

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on

11-18-03


Signature